

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00168 01 OF 02 131845Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00
SAJ-01 EB-07 NSC-05 /072 W
-----132000Z 032889 /42

R 131706Z JAN 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1110
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY ANKARA
AMEMBASSY ATHENS
CINCUSAFE
CINCUSNAVEUR
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0168

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: NATO MPOL TU MARR MASS
SUBJ: TURKEY AND NATO

REF: (A) 76 ANKARA 9483 (DTG 141235Z DEC 76)(NOTAL),
(B) 76 ANKARA 9832 (DTG 300735Z DEC 76)(NOTAL), (C) 76
USNATO 7005 (DTG 231542Z DEC 76)(NOTAL), (D) 76 USNATO
6943 (DTG 211417Z DEC 76)(NOTAL), (E) 76 USNATO 6747
(DTG 090816Z DEC 76)

SUMMARY: WE BELIEVE EMBASSY ANKARA'S LIST OF POSSIBLE
OPPORTUNITIES (TRAINING SITES, AD HOC GROUP ON MILITARY
ASSISTANCE, INFRASTRUCTURE, EPG AND EUROGROUP AND AEW)
SUGGESTED IN REF A FOR STRENGTHENING NATO-TURKISH RELATION-
SHIPS PROVIDES A USEFUL FRAMEWORK ON WHICH TO BUILD. WHILE
WE SHOULD CONTINUE TO MANAGE AS CAREFULLY AS POSSIBLE THE
EVOLUTION OF EACH LINK BETWEEN TURKEY AND NATO, WE DO NOT
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00168 01 OF 02 131845Z

AT THIS TIME BELIEVE THERE ARE SPECIFIC OPENINGS
WHICH CAN BE SIGNIFICANTLY EXPLOITED WITHOUT A MARKED
REORDERING OF US AND NATO PRIORITIES. ACCORDINGLY,
WE PROVIDE INFORMATION BELOW FOR BACKGROUND ON THE
CURRENT STATUS OF THE AREAS NOTED BY EMBASSY ANKARA.
WE SEE NO NEED FOR SPECIFIC GUIDANCE UNLESS WASHING-
TON BELIEVES IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO ALTER THE EVOLVING
US AND NATO APPROACHES IN ANY PARTICULAR CASE. END
SUMMARY.

1. TRAINING SITES. THE EURO/NATO TRAINING GROUP, UNDER PRESSURE FROM THE BELGIAN AND TURKISH MINISTERS OF DEFENSE, IS CURRENTLY STUDYING THE COST OF A EUROPEAN SOLUTION FOR JOINT JET PILOT TRAINING (JJPT), TO BE COMPARED WITH THE COST OF TRAINING IN THE US. THE EUROPEAN ALTERNATIVE TRAINING SITES UNDER REVIEW ARE IN ITALY, TURKEY AND POSSIBLY PORTUGAL. UNTIL TURKEY'S ANNOUNCEMENT AT THE DECEMBER 6, 1976 EUROGROUP MINISTERIAL MEETING (REF D) THAT "NO RESTRICTIONS WHATSOEVER WOULD BE PLACED ON USE OF THIS FACILITY," THE EUROGROUP HAD NOT SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED TURKEY. THE COST INVESTIGATION STUDY GROUP OF EURO/NATO TRAINING GROUP AIR FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE HAS BEEN DIRECTED TO PROVIDE TO THE EURO/NATO TRAINING GROUP AIR FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE THE COST OF EUROPEAN ALTERNATIVES NOT LATER THAN APRIL 1, 1977. WE SEE LITTLE PROSPECT, HOWEVER, FOR ADOPTION OF THE OTHER TYPES OF TRAINING FACILITIES IN TURKEY BECAUSE:

A. THE USE OF ANY TURKISH FACILITY FOR ARTILLERY AND ARMORED INFANTRY SUFFERS CONSIDERABLY IN COMPARISON WITH A CENTRAL EUROPEAN ALTERNATIVE IN TERMS OF TRANSPORTATION COSTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL DISPARITY;

B. EXPANSION OF TURKISH ARTILLERY RANGE TO USABLE SIZE WOULD REQUIRE LARGE EXPENDITURES; AND

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00168 01 OF 02 131845Z

C. ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATO UNDERSEA DIVING FACILITY ANYWHERE HAS BEEN REPEATEDLY FRUSTRATED BY THE APPARENT LACK OF ANY SIGNIFICANT NATO REQUIREMENT FOR SUCH A FACILITY. (MOST RECENTLY, THE DPC IN MINISTERIAL SESSION, DECEMBER 7-8, 1976, INVITED THE MILITARY COMMITTEE "TO ARRANGE FOR THE NECESSARY NATO POLICY ON DEEP SEA DIVING TO BE FORMULATED.")

2. AD HOC GROUP ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE. WE SHARE BALKAR'S PESSIMISM (REF B) THAT TURKEY'S DEFENSE NEEDS ARE NOT LIKELY TO BE MET TANGIBLY THROUGH RESULTS OF AD HOC GROUP DELIBERATIONS. THE PRINCIPAL FOCUS OF THE GROUP WILL PROBABLY BE ON PORTUGAL, THOUGH TURKEY WILL UNDOUBTEDLY WANT TO KEEP ITS NEEDS UNDER CONSIDERATION. IN ANY EVENT, IT MIGHT BE HELPFUL IF TURKEY REVISED THE EQUIPMENT LIST IT SHOWED US NATO DEPENDENT DECEMBER 21 ALONG THE LINES PROPOSED BY THE TURKISH DEFENSE ADVISOR (REF C). (NOTE: TURKISH DEFAD DID NOT LEAVE EQUIPMENT LIST WITH US, PENDING ITS REVISION.)

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 00168 02 OF 02 131940Z

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00
SAJ-01 EB-07 NSC-05 /072 W

-----131959Z 033351 /42

R 131706Z JAN 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1111
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY ANKARA
AMEMBASSY ATHENS
CINCUSAFE
CINCUSNAVEUR
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0168

3. INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM. WE HAVE BEEN AWARE OF AFSOUTH'S AND SOUTHERN REGION NATIONS' BELIEF THAT LARGER PERCENTAGES OF INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDS SHOULD BE SPENT IN THEIR REGION. CONSEQUENTLY, WE HAVE COOPERATED WITH SHAPE AND NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES IN ATTEMPTING TO FIND A METHOD BY WHICH ADDITIONAL PROJECTS OF SUFFICIENT MILITARY URGENCY COULD BE IDENTIFIED AND PROGRAMMED. WE WILL CONTINUE THESE EFFORTS, BUT COULD NOT SUPPORT A MOVE BY WHICH NATO'S POLITICAL AUTHORITIES WOULD FORCE SHAPE TO DEVOTE ITS SCARCE INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDS TO PROJECTS WITH RELATIVELY LOW MILITARY PRIORITIES. TO DO SO WOULD UNDERMINE THE PROGRESS WHICH HAS BEEN MADE IN THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM IN CONVERTING IT FROM A DEVICE FOR AIDING LESS DEVELOPED ALLIES TO A PROGRAM THAT CONCENTRATES ON THE DEFENSE NEEDS OF THE ALLIANCE. WHILE WE RECOGNIZE THAT OVER MOST OF THE LIFE OF THE PROGRAM, TURKEY HAS BEEN A VALUABLE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00168 02 OF 02 131940Z

ALLY IN ITS SUPPORT, WE ALSO NOTE THAT THE RETURN TO TURKEY HAS BEEN SOME SIX TIMES ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROGRAM. IN ADDITION, OVER THE PAST TWO OR THREE YEARS, TURKISH REPRESENTATIVES HAVE BECOME MODERATELY TROUBLESOME IN HOLDING UP FUND AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PROJECTS IN OTHER COUNTRIES, AND IN DELAYING ANNUAL SLICE APPROVAL BY AS MUCH AS SIX MONTHS WHILE BATTLING WITH SHAPE FOR THE INCLUSION OF PROJECTS MORE POLITICALLY IMPORTANT TO MOD TURKEY THAN MILITARILY IMPORTANT TO SHAPE. IN ADDITON (CONTRARY TO THE STATEMENT IN REF A), TURKEY DECLINED DURING THE NEGOTIATION OF THE CURRENT FIVE-YEAR (1975-79) INFRASTRUCTURE COST SHARING AGREEMENT TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE US SPECIAL PROGRAM (USSP), OR

EVEN TO APPLY THE TURKISH SHARE OF THE USSP TO THE NORMAL PROGRAM. THE US FINALLY AGREED TO PICK UP THE SHORTFALL ON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE USSP BE ADJUSTED ACCORDINGLY. THE TURKISH POSITION ON A USSP ELEMENT FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE CEILING INCREASE NOW UNDER DISCUSSION REMAINS AS EXPLAINED ABOVE, AND WE BELIEVE THAT IS WHAT THE TURKISH SPOKESMAN (BATU) MEANT WHEN HE TOLD MINISTERS IN THE DECEMBER 1976 MEETING THAT TURKEY INSISTED ON MAINTAINING THE PREVIOUS COST SHARING FORMULA (REF E). IN ANY EVENT, FOR THE REASONS NOTED ABOVE, WE BELIEVE THAT ANY ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO TURKEY THROUGH THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM WOULD BE EXTREMELY LIMITED COMPARED TO TURKEY'S OVERALL MILITARY NEED.

4. EPG AND EUROGROUP. WE OF COURSE HAVE NO VOICE IN EUROGROUP AND EPG DELIBERATIONS, SO THERE IS LITTLE WE CAN DO DIRECTLY TO ENCOURAGE OUR EUROPEAN ALLIES TO GIVE THE TURKS A GREATER SHARE IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND COPRODUCTION OF WEAPONS. WE WILL CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE OUR ALLIES TO GIVE THE TURKS FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION IN THE EUROGROUP AND EPG THROUGH DISCUSSIONS IN THE EWG AND OTHER NATO FORA, BOTH FORMALLY AND INFORMALLY. WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE TURKS ARE FULLY PARTICIPATING IN THE EPG, AND HAVE INDICATED A SPECIFIC INTEREST IN ANTI-TANK WEAPONS. WE ARE UNAWARE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00168 02 OF 02 131940Z

OF, BUT COULD NOT RULE OUT, A SIMILAR INTEREST IN OTHER WEAPONS SYSTEMS.

5. AEW. REGARDING BALKAR'S STATEMENT (REF B) THAT THE GOT HAS RECEIVED INDICATIONS FROM ASYG LABERGE'S OFFICE THAT A FORWARD OPERATIONS BASE FOR THE NATO AEW WILL BE LOCATED IN TURKEY, LABERGE DOES NOT BELIEVE THAT HE GAVE ANY SUCH ASSURANCE TO GOT. THE DETERMINATION OF BASE LOCATIONS FOR THE NATO AEW FORCE WILL BE BASED ON THE OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AS STATED BY THE MAJOR NATO COMMANDERS (MNCS). NOTWITHSTANDING, WHILE NO DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE, IT IS TRUE THAT TURKEY IS ONE OF THE PRIMARY FOB LOCATIONS UNDER STUDY BY THE MNCS. STRAUSS-HUPE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 30-Aug-1999 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 13-Jan-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977NATO00168
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: n/a
Format: TEL
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770191/baaabbel.tel
Line Count: 206
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Message ID: 329184de-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) 76 ANKARA 9483 (DTG 141235Z DEC 76)(NOTAL), (B) 76 ANKARA 9832 (DTG 300735Z DEC 76)(NOTAL), (C) 76 USNATO 7005 (DTG 231542Z DEC 76)(NOTAL), (D) 76 USNATO 6943 (DTG 211417Z DEC 76)(NOTAL), (E) 76 USNATO 6747 (DTG 090816Z DEC 76)
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 26-Oct-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3680093
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: TURKEY AND NATO
TAGS: NATO MPOL TU MARR MASS
To: STATE SECDEF MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/329184de-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

